

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Arts - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Arts, Social Sciences & Humanities

2006

Towards a new model of foreign policy change

Joakim Eidenfalk
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/artspapers>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eidenfalk, Joakim, Towards a new model of foreign policy change 2006.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/artspapers/1628>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Towards a New Model of Foreign Policy Change¹

**Joakim Eidenfalk
PhD-Candidate
School of History and Politics
University of Wollongong**

Abstract

Why do states change their foreign policy? Foreign Policy Change is a relatively young field, which has produced a number of theoretical models in order to explain what lies behind changes in a state's foreign policy. This paper presents a recently developed foreign policy change model, containing independent, intervening and dependent variables. The independent variables are divided up into domestic and international sources of change, with nine further subcategories, which aim at identifying the factors that may or may not influence a government in its foreign policy decision-making. The next step investigated by the paper is the intervening variable, that is, the decision-making process. Specifically it examines the key decision-makers and tries to identify how they came to perceive a window of opportunity within the intervening variable category, possibly even starting the process themselves, in order to estimate their possible influence in this process. Finally, the model attempts to measure the extent of change by looking at the scope, domain, and effect of change. By applying this model to decisions that cause a foreign policy change, the actors and factors interacting and contributing to the change in foreign policy will be identified, leading to an explanation as to why the particular government changed its foreign policy, and finally allowing the amount of change to be estimated.

When a state changes its foreign policy it can affect both the state and the international political system profoundly. It can be disruptive and even lead to warfare. The underlying causes of foreign policy change are therefore important to understand. This study attempts to further the understanding of the causes of foreign policy change.

Several theoretical models have been constructed by other scholars (e.g. Goldmann 1982, Holsti 1982, Hallenberg 1984 Hermann 1990, Carlsnaes 1992 & 1993, Rosati et al 1994, Jian 1996, Oldfield 1998, Ataman 1999, Gustavsson 1998 & 1999, Kleistra & Mayer 2001). However, each of these models either ignores or does not deal adequately with certain factors, making them insufficient to fully explain foreign policy change. The model presented in this study attempts to include all of the factors that affect a government's decision to change its foreign policy, and to incorporate them into a theoretical model that can be used to explain foreign policy change. This model introduces factors not previously included in earlier models, such as the media and public opinion, and global and regional categories. It takes into account the leader's ability to create a "Window of Opportunity", while earlier models have assumed that foreign policy change begins in a structural change within the sources of change. This paper will argue that change can begin in the intervening variable as well, with a key

¹ Several parts of this paper has been developed in cooperation with Fredrik Doeser of Södertörn University College, Sweden. Many of our findings will be published in a forthcoming article.

decision-maker initiating the change by trying to influence the factors in the sources of change-category, creating an opportunity leading to a change in foreign policy. Norms are also considered specifically as a factor needed to take into consideration, which in earlier contributions has only been considered indirectly, if at all.

It also includes a modified typology of change, labelled the extent of change, which looks at change in a new way by looking at the scope, domain, and effect of change, thereby measuring the extent of change. This is a new approach to measure change, looking at different dimensions and aspects of the change itself. It is also the first model so far to investigate the consequences of change, thereby evaluating the effect of the foreign policy change after a certain amount of time, rather than just looking at the time when the policy is changed.

One important aspect of the new categories and aspects in this model is that this model has a balanced focus on each part of the model, unlike earlier models, which tend to focus on one or two steps of the process. By adding all these new categories and aspects in to this new model, it increases the ability to explain why foreign policy change occur in a more comprehensive manner compared to earlier models of foreign policy change. By looking at the independent influence of a factor, and the interaction between the different factors, our understanding of why foreign policy change can suddenly occur will increase. It is the aim, and the hope, that this model will increase the explanatory ability to understand the actors and factors influencing and contributing to foreign policy change.

It is important when this model is applied to a case study that it is used as a “checklist-model”, that is, to investigate all the categories and aspects of the model on the case in question. It is also important that the researcher, after looking at all the categories and aspects that (s)he asks the following questions: Which factors/aspects were important in the foreign policy process studied? Did they influence the decision-maker(s) independently of each other, or did two or more categories/aspects interact, perhaps fuelling each other, to create enough pressure on the decision-maker(s) to perceive and act towards a change in foreign policy? Did the decision-maker initiate the process on his/her own? Simply listing the factors/aspects involved is not enough, the interaction and the influence they may have on each other, and on the decision-maker, are important to take into consideration, to fully understand and appreciate what caused the foreign policy change and the effects it had.

It should be made clear that the resulting model is designed for the study of foreign policy change in functioning parliamentary and presidential democracies. It is believed that it offers an explanatory richness for instances of change in such countries not found in previous models. Moreover, it is not ruled out that the model may be applicable to other regime types. For example, public opinion may be seen as not influential in an authoritarian regime, however, pressure from the public can be large enough to make the leader considering a foreign policy change, in order to sustain his grip of power. Also, the interest-group category could include, for example, the military, which may have quite an influence in a dictatorship, or it could include movements, such as Solidarity in Poland in the 1980s, which proved to have an influence on government decision-making.

SOURCES OF CHANGE

Domestic factors of change

The sources of change are divided into domestic and international factors. Focus is divided equally between each set of factors, although, depending on the case study, either factor could be more influential than the other.

Robert D. Putnam has argued that domestic and international politics often affect each other. The “two-level game”, as he labelled it, refers to how domestic

politics sometimes affect international politics, and vice-versa (Putnam 1988:427). Joe D. Hagan also argues that government leaders have to deal with pressures and constraints from domestic political sources, as well as the international political system (Hagan 1995:117). Domestic factors must therefore be taken into consideration when foreign policy change is studied. A study of foreign policy would not be complete without a comprehensive examination of the domestic factors, as well as international factors.

Domestic factors play an important part in influencing and pressuring governments into a possible foreign policy change. Key decision-makers need to take domestic factors into account when deciding foreign policies, since they count on the latter's support in order to stay in power. Public opinion and the media can have a considerable impact on government policies if dissent or approval is powerful enough. Support from other political parties and other actors in the society are also important in order to uphold a particular foreign policy (Gustavsson 1998:23).

Five domestic sources of change are identified below: the Bureaucracy, Public Opinion, the Media, Interest Groups, and Political Parties. By categorising those in this way, this helps the researcher in his categorisation of the influence of these different sources of change, as well as making it easier for the reader to understand the different domestic sources of change.

The Bureaucracy:

The bureaucracy is traditionally viewed as a source of stability rather than as a source of change. Bureaucratic inertia and standard operating procedures have been identified as obstacles that needed to be overcome in order to produce a foreign policy change (see e.g. Volgy & Schwarz 1994:27-28, Hermann 1990:8, Goldmann 1988:54-55, Skidmore 1994:47, Rosati 1994:229, Allison 1999). According to Morton Halperin:

One of the truisms of bureaucracy is that it resists change (Halperin 1974:308).

The bureaucratic system is basically inert; it moves only when pushed hard and persistently. The majority of bureaucrats prefer to maintain the status quo, and only a small group is, at any one time, advocating change. Time and resources of any one person in the bureaucracy are limited, and when a participant does desire change, he must choose carefully the issues on which to do battle (Halperin 1974:99).

However, as Hermann states in his model, a group within the government, which is well placed with access to top officials, can be effective in advocating a change in policy. Kalevi J. Holsti's study of foreign policy change investigated eight case studies and showed that in only one case the bureaucracy play an important role in advocating a change in policy. This, however, proves that the bureaucracy *can* have a prominent role in foreign policy change. For the purposes of this paper, the model draws inspiration from Hermann and Holsti and has therefore included "the bureaucracy" as a source of change (Hermann 1990:11-12, Holsti 1982:207).

Public Opinion:

This category is an important source of change since government officials require support from enough voters in order to pursue its policy and to assure re-election. If the public becomes dissatisfied enough with a certain policy conducted by the government, as, for example, when expressed through demonstrations, pressure is put on the decision-makers, and this **can** lead to a foreign policy change.

Foreign policy-issues generally suffer from low visibility in the media, which contributes to the inactivity of public opinion. The complexity of foreign policy also tends to keep foreign policy salient, unless it is an event of crisis proportions, such as the September-11 terrorist attacks, the Bali-bombing, or the Iraq-war. In such events, public opinion can quickly shift and respond to information provided by the government or by the media (Shapiro & Jacobs 2000:223-24).

Public opinion is also important in providing support for interest groups and other societal actors in their efforts to influence government decisions. Public opinion is therefore not only a source from which the government can draw support for its policies; it is also a source of change in itself and for other actors trying to achieve a foreign policy change (Risse-Kappen 1991:510-11). It has therefore been included in this theoretical model.

The Media:

Abbas Malek and Krista E. Wiegand point out that several studies have shown the influence that the media can have on foreign policy. The media is the link between the public and the government, which means that the policy-makers need to take the media into consideration if they want to successfully build support for their policies (Malek & Wiegand 1998:13-14).

The media serves several purposes in regards to influence foreign policy change. They can be an important factor as in setting the agenda, and in forming public opinion; they provide information from the government to the public (Kingdon 1984:61). The media can also be an investigator, providing new information for the government and/or the public, which can cause a change in foreign policy. They can also act as a forum for different actors to legitimise or pressurise a certain policy.

The media can exercise significant influence on policy issues by endorsing or condemning a certain policy, thereby putting additional pressure on a government in its decision-making, and influencing public opinion. In turn this can put pressure on the government. The media have therefore been included as a source of change in this model.

Interest groups

Interest groups here follow the definition of John W. Dietrich, who describes them as

an organised association, which engages in activity relative to government decisions. It includes groups formed by citizens, organised around a particular issue, as well as professional lobbies, businesses, and public interest law firms (Dietrich 1999:281).

The influence of interest groups has increased in the recent decades. By generally focusing on single issues that attract attention from voters, which in turn causes political decision-makers to take them seriously since the alternative could possibly mean a loss of votes, they are in a position to influence policy-makers (Warhurst 2004:167-69).

Access and activity are important for interest groups in order to influence policies, although access and activity are not a guarantee in themselves for successful influence. Moreover, increasing globalisation further enhances the leverage and influence of interest groups (Dietrich 1999:281ff). For these reasons, interest groups have been included as a source of change.

Political parties

Finally, this category refers to political parties in parliament, mainly political parties whose support the government needs in order to govern, or in order to continue/change

a specific policy. Opposition parties are also included in this category as an influential factor in shaping policy.

Pressure from the electorate or public opinion in general can generate pressure on members of Parliament that may lead them to put pressure on the government over a particular policy issue. The government often relies on support from other parties or party members and may therefore have to consider their views in the making of policy (Gustavsson 1998:23).

International factors of change

Today's international politics is a complex system consisting of states, institutions and non-state actors, all interacting with each other on different levels. Important factors to consider when studying the effects of international factors on foreign policy decision-making, apart from the actors, are Power, Norms, and Institutions.

According to realist theory, the international political system essentially consists of a struggle for the distribution of power. Military power is seen as the main and most important asset in attaining an edge over other states. Suspicion of other states and one's own survival are the main features of the mindsets of states. There are no authorities above the states that can dictate to states about how to behave, and states are the main actors in the international arena (Mearsheimer 1995:336-337). Realist theory can explain many situations and events in today's politics; however, it fails to take into account the increased role played by international institutions and non-state actors.

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye made the argument that realist theory fails to recognise the importance of other factors that need to be considered in order to understand all aspects of today's politics. Keohane and Nye constructed their own counter-theory, labelled Complex Interdependence, which, they argue, accounts for many aspects of international politics that realist theory cannot explain sufficiently. In their view, international politics is sometimes best-explained using realist theory, and at other times better explained by applying complex interdependence (Keohane and Nye 2001:20-22).

Keohane and Nye argue that although states are often the main actors, other actors are also important nowadays. Institutions and non-state actors play a major role, exerting influence on states, and provide multiple channels for the different actors to use to achieve their aims. Transnational corporations and other non-state actors, such as terrorist networks and non-governmental organisations, can also influence international affairs. Security issues are not always on the top of the agenda, as realists argue, and military force is not always chosen as the best way of achieving one's aims (Keohane & Nye 2001:20-22). Therefore, Complex Interdependence can often be used as an explanatory tool, rather than realism.

In this study, realism and Complex Interdependence will be used in order to explain the international factors influencing foreign policy decision-making. With regard to foreign policy, they will enhance the explanatory capability of the influences of the international political system on a government's decision-making, and specifically about how it contributes to foreign policy *change*. The international factors have been divided into four sources of change; Global factors, Regional factors, Bilateral relations, and Non-state actors.

The norms accepted by the major actors in the international political system will also be taken into account. Accepted goals of many or most international actors, such as the expansion of democracy, human rights, non-intervention into sovereign states (with the occasional exception of humanitarian intervention), and self-determination can impact on the state's foreign policy, particularly if pursued by the government in question, or by actors aiming to influence the government's foreign policy direction. They will therefore be taken into account when examining the international factors in

this study. Similarly, global and regional policies pursued by great powers will also have an effect on a state's ability and willingness to act. The "war on terror", for example, has had a profound effect on a majority of states in the international political system today (Wright-Neville 2004:53).

Finally, international institutions will be divided up into two categories. International institutions where the states are the member will be included in the Global and Regional categories, while international institutions comprising non-governmental actors will be included in the Non-state category.

Global factors:

This category focus on changes in the international political system that have a global impact and that have an effect on a state's foreign policy-making. The end of the Cold War provides an example of a change that fits into this category. An event or actor in this category could affect the state in questions of policy-making, and may or may not lead to a change in foreign policy. For example, the September 11-attacks led to the US-led "War on Terror", which influences many states in a variety of ways in today's world politics. International institutions and accepted norms may also have a major impact on a state's foreign policy.

The influence of an event, a shift in the balance of the international political system, a shift in international norms (official or merely accepted), or international institutions (consisting of states), can all have an impact on a state's foreign policy. *Global factors* have therefore been included as a category in the International factors.

Regional factors:

An event or actors may also have a regional rather than global impact. An example of this could be the Bali-bombing in October 2002, which had a profound effect on the area, including Southeast Asia, Australia and the South Pacific. An event in this particular category can affect the regional political system, rather than the whole international political system. A state's policy-maker within this region could be affected, and it may or may not lead to a foreign policy change.

Regional actors, such as regional institutions (consisting of states), may have a substantial impact on a state's foreign policy-formation. Also, accepted norms within a particular region may also have to be taken into consideration when a government outlines its foreign policy. Different regions can have different norms, stemming from particular cultural, historical and traditional values.

The regional balance of power must also be considered when conducting a study like this. The power and capabilities of regional actors will affect regional politics, particularly when a state is considering its foreign policy actions.

It is clear that a global factor-category alone will not suffice. For all the above-mentioned reasons, a *Regional factor*-category has been included in this theoretical model.

Bilateral relations:

This category will take into account the government's bilateral relations with other actors. Mainly these will be states, but can also include a global or regional institution. This category will only be affected when contacts or influence are conducted between the state investigated and *one* other actor.

Actors, such as states and international institutions, can influence another state by using leverage, such as an alliance, trade, or through military and economic threats, to pressure them into adopting an adjusted or different foreign policy. Different levels of incentives and/or threats will have different effects on the policy-makers, but they

will have an effect nonetheless. Bilateral relations are therefore important as a source of change in this model.

Non-state actors:

Finally, the growing influence of transnational actors in international politics has been recognised. Transnational actors, such as criminal networks, terrorist networks, corporations, human rights organisations, etc, all play a role, which can shape and influence a state's foreign policy. Although states are recognised as the primary actors in the international political system, non-state actors cannot be ignored in a study of foreign policy change, since they can carry with them significant influence and power on certain issues. A decision-maker may have to take into account the influence of non-state actors when deciding on a foreign policy. It has therefore been included as a category in this model.

WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY

The next step in the model is labelled "Window of Opportunity" and is inspired by Gustavsson's second step in his foreign policy change-model, and by Roger Kingdon's discussion on "policy windows" (Gustavsson 1998 & 1999 and Kingdon 1984). Sources of change need to pass through this step in order to have an impact on the decision-making process, and ultimately, to cause a foreign policy change. The main actor in this step is the key decision-makers and their perceptions.

It is in this category that the key decision-maker perceives a policy window, either through pressure or influence from the sources of change, or realising him- or herself that there is an opportunity that (s)he has been waiting for in order to push through a policy agenda. In other words, the policy process can begin either with the sources of change or with the key decision-maker him- or herself.

Perception is therefore a key term in this category and therefore needs to be defined. This study will adhere to Richard Herrmann's definition of perception "as a concept that describes the construction of reality in which an individual makes foreign-policy decisions" (Herrmann 1986:843).

A key decision-maker's perception can be affected by a number of personal characteristics. Margaret G. Hermann has listed six different types of personal characteristics of a political leader (Hermann 1980:8-14, and Hermann 1977:21-23), which are of interest for this study and model. They are:

- Beliefs
- Motives
- Decision style
- Interpersonal style
- Interest in foreign affairs
- Training in foreign affairs
-

Beliefs refer to the fundamental assumptions of the political leader, which will affect the leader's interpretation of his environment, and which thereby affect the strategies the leader will use.

Motives refer to the reasons why the leader is doing what (s)he is doing. The need for power, need for affiliation, and need for approval are the most common motives referred to by Margaret Hermann.

Decision style refers to the political leader's preferred method of making decisions. Examples of this could be his or her preference for certain levels of risk, and how open (s)he is to new information.

Interpersonal style refers to how the political leader deals with other policy makers. Hermann points out two characteristics that stand out, that is, paranoia and Machiavellianism. Paranoia is defined as “excessive suspiciousness” and Machiavellianism as “unscrupulous, manipulative behavior” (Hermann 1980:10).

Training in foreign affairs refers to the amount of experience the leader has in regards to foreign policy. This will affect how the political leader will act and the strategies (s)he will undertake.

Interest in foreign affairs refers to the leader’s interest in foreign policy and it will affect the amount of participation by the leader. If (s)he has little interest in foreign affairs, (s)he is likely to delegate authority to others, such as the foreign minister. If, on the other hand, (s)he has significant interest in foreign affairs, (s)he is likely to be consulted on decisions and be kept informed of what is happening in foreign affairs. (S)he will then take charge of the foreign policy making and lead out of his or her office rather than letting others deal with the foreign policy issues (Hermann 1980:8-14). This may, in turn, affect the way a leader perceives structural conditions.

In order to achieve/cause a foreign policy change, structural conditions need to be acted on by the key decision-makers. Structural conditions cannot in themselves change a foreign policy. Rather, they need to be perceived and acted upon by key decision-makers. In order to constrain or enable a policy change, they need to be part of the decision-maker’s thought process. The way they are acted upon depends on the perceptions and intentions of the decision-maker (Giddens 1984:26).

An integral part of this step in the model is the “policy window”. This is when an opportunity presents itself and a key decision-maker can push through his or her agenda. Roger Kingdon compares a policy window to a space launch:

The target planets are in proper alignment, but will not stay that way for long. Thus the launch must take place when the window is open, lest the opportunity slip away. Once lost, the opportunity may recur, but in the interim, astronauts and space engineers must wait until the window reopens” (Kingdon 1984:174).

This analogy can be compared to the political processes. Timing is of the essence here. Kingdon points to several reasons why a policy window may close; 1. the participants may feel that they have acted or decided on it and the issue is taken off the agenda. 2, the issue may have been acted upon but has failed to get action and attention is turned to other issues on the political agenda. 3, The event that caused the window to open, such as a crisis or event that has been in focus, may not last long. Failure to act on it quickly enough may lead to a missed opportunity when the people’s excitement fades away. 4, if a change in personnel caused the window to open, a renewed change in personnel could close the window again. 5, there may not be an alternative available and the opportunity is surpassed (Kingdon 1984:177-78).

The window of opportunity is seized and acted upon by the key decision-maker. It is vital to this study that the key decision-makers perceive the change. If not, (s)he will not act on it, therefore there will be no decision-making process, and subsequently no foreign policy change.

Earlier theoretical models (see e.g. Gustavsson 1998) assumed that a change in structural conditions is necessary to cause a foreign policy change. A decision-maker reacts to the sources of change, which leads to a decision-making process, which in turn leads to a foreign policy change. However, a key decision-maker can have a political agenda which (s)he wants to push through. (S)he may have already tried to do this already, but failed, and is now just biding his or her time. (S)he patiently works toward

achieving his agenda, by trying to change structural conditions him- or herself, building support among the sources of change by creating an image of a problem in the policy, thereby justifying a policy change. Basically, (s)he is doing the groundwork, so that when the “Window of Opportunity” presents itself, (s)he seizes and acts on it. The decision-making process begins, which could lead to his or her desired policy change.

John Kingdon discusses how windows open and close constantly and how interested parties need to seize the opportunity in order to push their agenda through. Timing is essential, as is the ability to get in on the government’s agenda, in order to be successful. However, Kingdon portrays policy entrepreneurs who constantly wait for their opportunity to push their agenda on to the government, but he does not mention the government, or the head of government specifically, in his discussion (Kingdon 1984:173-204). A President, Prime Minister, or any kind of head of government, would be in a much better position to push his or her own agenda, particularly in getting it on the government’s agenda, constructing consensus within the government, and realising his or her goal. Therefore, to an extent, a leader of a country may well be able to create his or her own “Window of Opportunity”, using his or her position and the resources available to him or her.

The process can therefore begin in the “Window of Opportunity”-step and go in the opposite direction, towards the sources of change. In other words, there are two different scenarios that can lead to a foreign policy change presented in this model.

Scenario 1 = Change in structural conditions – sources of change influence/pressure – perceived and acted upon by key decision-maker – decision-making process - foreign policy change

Scenario 2 = key decision-makers political agenda – changes in structural conditions – window of opportunity perceived by key decision-maker – key decision-maker pushes his or her agenda/decision-making process – foreign policy change. This step then leads to the sources of change and then to the decision-making process, or to the decision-making process directly, depending on the scenario to hand.

THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

This next step in the model is “the decision-making process”. Key decision-makers work within established institutional structures to bring about a change in foreign policy (Gustavsson 1999:84). The sources of change interact with the key decision-makers within the decision-making process, in order to bring about a foreign policy change.

There are several important parts in this process. Charles F. Hermann has identified seven stages that he believes need to be addressed for a policy change to occur. They are:

1. Initial policy expectations
2. External actor/environmental stimuli
3. Recognition of discrepant information
4. Postulation of a connection between problem and policy
5. Development of alternatives
6. Building authoritative consensus for choice
7. Implementation of new policy (Hermann 1990:14-20)

When studying foreign policy change, Hermann’s seven stages in the decision-making process will be kept in mind, but they will not be followed strictly. While several important aspects in his seven proposed stages need to be taken into account, following his stages strictly and ‘ticking the boxes’, will only constrain the study. A certain degree of flexibility will benefit the research.

Hermann’s conception of the decision-making process also seems to focus on a collective factor, rather than on key decision-makers. This study will look at the

decision-making process as a whole, but at the same time it will maintain a particular focus on the key individual decision-makers.

Charles F. Hermann, Robert Billings and Robert Litchfield (1999) produced a paper on sequential decision-making, that is, when decision-makers engage in a sequence of decisions regarding the same policy-issue for a longer period. Control theory is incorporated into this discussion. The focus of their study is when leaders will continue the previous policy - despite information which shows that the policy is not working - and when they decide to change the policy. In regard to my study, this paper is limited in its focus since it concentrates only on the decision-making process, and is not concerned with other external factors. However, it is still relevant to the decision-making part of this model.

Finally, the decision-making process may lead to a foreign policy change. The next step in the model is therefore a typology of change - that is, the extent of change that has occurred.

THE EXTENT OF CHANGE

This next step in the model will define the extent of change that has taken place. It takes the individual state as its point of departure. Earlier model's typologies of change are not specific enough to capture the different forms of change we observe in contemporary international relations. Inspired by David Baldwin and his dimensions of power (Baldwin, 2002: 178f), an alternative approach is suggested to capture change. The proposal is that the researcher should ask two questions when evaluating the extent of change. First, how many issue-areas does the change in foreign policy intend to affect and how heavily are these issue-areas influenced? This dimension of change can be termed the scope of change. Three areas need to be investigated – political, economic and security.

The political area refers to changes in states' diplomatic activities, such as negotiation and representation. The economic area deals with changes in trade and investments. The security area refers to how states deal with different kinds of threats, both military and non-military. Although all three issue-areas may be affected, one must take into consideration how heavily each issue-area is affected. For instance, by applying for EC membership, the Finnish and Swedish governments intended to restructure foreign policy in all three issue-areas. However, the Finnish security and economic positions changed in a more decisive way than they did for Sweden, due to Finland's previous relationship with the Soviet Union. Thus, it is not enough to assess which issue-areas were affected but also how heavily each issue-area was affected. Second, how many actors is the foreign policy change directed against? This dimension of change can be termed the domain of change. Is it a single actor (bilateral relations), a small or a large community of states, or does it intend to reshape the international system (i.e. policy has a global reach)?

Finally, a third step is introduced, labeled the effect of change. Once the scope and domain of change has been established, this third step looks at how the change has affected the issue-areas and actors affected. This is achieved by looking at the details of the change. What change exactly? For example, troops shipped to a conflict area have increased, or foreign aid has increased, or the instrument of the policy has changed from diplomatic means to military means, and so on. It is important, however, to also look at the big picture of the change. Has the policy changed towards a more activist approach or has it moved towards a more isolationistic approach?

In sum, in order to assess the extent of change one should look at the scope, domain, and effect of change together. For example, a policy change that only affects one issue area, one actor and only involve small changes in means will most likely be smaller in its intended effect than a policy change that affects two or three issue areas, a

large community of states, and resulting in a more activist policy. The most extreme form of change would therefore be a case wherein all three issue-areas are heavily affected on a global reach, changing the state's policy from an isolationist policy to a more activist approach.

FEEDBACK/ The Consequences of Change

Finally, the consequences of change will be evaluated. Feedback to the sources of change and the government may stabilise the new policy or lead to a new round of foreign policy change.

In order to define what has changed and how it has affected the government's relations with the international actors, four different areas will be examined: Political, social, economics, and security. The question that needs to be asked is, how has the policy affected the relevant actors in these different areas? Has it improved the relations, do they remain the same, or have they worsened?

Domestic actors will also be examined through a discussion of whether relations have improved, remain the same, or if they have worsened. The discussion will be based on the findings in the case studies for a short time after the policy change. This will enable the researcher to evaluate the policy change, not only from the government's point of view, but also from other actors' points of view.

CONCLUSION

The new aspects and categories that this model introduces are intended to address the shortcomings of earlier models produced to explain foreign policy change. By looking at norms more specifically and including factors ignored or not adequately addressed in earlier models, such as public opinion and the media, global and regional factors, the independent variable increases the understanding of what causes and influences foreign policy change. Investigating key decision-makers and their perception of changes in the sources of change, while at the same time allow for the possibility that the change might stem from the decision-maker himself, further increases the explanatory ability of this model.

Finally, the new extent of change-category covers several dimensions in the concept of change. By looking at the scope, domain, and effect of change, the researcher can pinpoint the extent of change more accurately than earlier models, by addressing; who is affected, how many issue-areas, how much are they influenced, and what effect does the change intend to cause? Finally, to further assess the effect of the policy change an added category is introduced, named the consequences of change, which evaluates the policy after a stipulated amount of time.

The model presented in this paper adds new categories and aspects to all three steps in the model, compared to earlier models. It looks at the interaction between them. It also puts equal weight to all three steps in the process, which has usually not been the case in earlier models. Put together these changes from earlier contributions hopes to make for a model with more explanatory ability than earlier models.

Once applied on one or more case studies, which are currently in progress, its strengths and weaknesses will be highlighted, which might lead to adjustments to the model. However, it is the belief and aim of this paper that this model will be a contribution towards a greater understanding to what causes and influences foreign policy change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, G. and Zelikow, P. *Essence of the Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Longman, New York; Harlow, Second edition, 1999.

- Ataman, M. *An Integrated Approach to Foreign Policy Change: Explaining Changes in Turkish Foreign Policy in the 1980s*, University of Kentucky, Doctoral Dissertation, 1999.
- Baldwin, D. A. *Power and International Relations*, in W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse and B.A.Simmons (eds.) *Handbook of International Relations*, pp. 177-191. London: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Carlsnaes, W. The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis, *International Studies Quarterly*, 36, pp. 245-70, 1992.
- Carlsnaes, W. On Analysing the Dynamics of Foreign Policy Change: A Critique and Reconceptualization, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 28-1, pp. 5-30, 1993.
- Dietrich, J.W. Interest Groups and Foreign Policy: Clinton and the China MFN Debates, *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, v29, i2, June 1999, pp.280-
- Giddens, A. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984.
- Goldmann, K. Change and Stability in Foreign Policy: Détente as a Problem of Stabilization, *World Politics*, 34-2, pp.230-66, 1982.
- Gustavsson, J. The Politics of Foreign Policy Change: Explaining the Swedish Reorientation on EC Membership, Lund University Press, Lund, Doctoral Dissertation, 1998.
- Gustavsson, J. How Should We Study Foreign Policy Change?, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 34-1, pp. 73-95, 1999.
- Hagan, J.D. Domestic Political Explanations in the Analysis of Foreign Policy, in (eds) Neack, L., Hey, J.A.K. and Haney, P.J. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1995.
- Hall, P. A. Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25-3: 275-296, 1993.
- Hallenberg, J. Foreign Policy Change: United States Foreign Policy Toward the Soviet Union and The People's Republic of China 1961-1980, University of Stockholm, Stockholm, Doctoral Dissertation, 1984.
- Halperin, M. Bureaucratic politics and foreign policy, The Brookings Institution, Washington D.C. 1974.
- Hermann, C. F. Changing Course: When Governments Choose to Redirect Foreign Policy, *International Studies Quarterly*, 34, pp.3-21, 1990.
- Hermann, C.F. & Billings, R.S. & Litchfield, R. Escalation and Modification: Responding to Negative Feedback in Sequential Decision Making, Paper presented at the Fifth National Conference on Public Management Research, December 3-4 1999, Texas A&M University.
- Hermann, M.G. Introduction: A Statement of Issues, in (Ed) Hermann, M.G. with Milburn, T.W. *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*, The Free Press, New York, 1977.
- Hermann, M.G. Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.24, No.1, March 1980, pp. 7-46.
- Herrmann, R. The Power of Perceptions in Foreign Policy Decision Making: Do Views of the Soviet Union Determine the Policy Choices of American Leaders? *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol.30, No.4, November 1986, pp.841-75.
- Holsti, K. J. (Ed) *Why Nations Realign: Foreign Policy Restructuring in the Postwar World*, Allen & Unwin, London, 1982.
- Jian, S. *Foreign Policy Restructuring as Adaptive Behavior, China's Independent Foreign Policy 1982-1989*, University Press of America, Inc. Lanham, 1996.
- Keohane, R.O. & Nye, J.S. *Power and Interdependence*, Longman, New York, Third edition, 2001.

- Kingdon, J.W. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1984.
- Kleistra, Y. & Mayer, I. Stability and Flux in Foreign Affairs: Modelling Policy and Organisational Change, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 36-4, pp. 381-414.
- Malek, A. & Wiegand, K.E. News Media and Foreign Policy: an integrated review, in (Ed.) Malek, A. *News Media and Foreign Relations: a multifaceted perspective*, Ablex Publishing Corporation, Norwood N.J. Second edition, 1998.
- Mearsheimer, J.J. *The False Promise of International Institutions*, in (Eds.) Brown, M.E. & Lynn-Jones, S.M. & Miller, S.E. *The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1995.
- Oldfield, D.D. The Restructuring of Thailand's Foreign Policy Towards Laos, 1988-1991, Northern Illinois University, Doctoral Dissertation, 1998.
- Putnam, R.D. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games, *International Organization*, Vol.42, No.3, (summer 1988), pp.427-60.
- Risse-Kappen, T. Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies, *World Politics*, Vol.43, No.4, July 1991, pp.479-512.
- Rosati, J.A. Cycles in Foreign Policy Restructuring: The Politics of Continuity and Change in U.S. Foreign Policy, in (eds) Hagan, J.D. & Rosati, J.A. & Sampson, M.W.III, *Foreign Policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change*, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1994.
- Shapiro, R.Y. & Jacobs, L.R. Who Leads and Who Follows? U.S. Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy, in (Eds) Shapiro, R.Y. and Isernia, P. and Nacos, B.L. *Decisionmaking in a glasshouse: Mass media, public opinion, and American and European foreign policy in the 21st century*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md. 2000.
- Skidmore, D. Explaining State Responses to International Change: the Structural Sources of Foreign Policy Rigidity and Change, in (eds) Hagan, J.D. & Rosati, J.A. & Sampson, M.W.III, *Foreign Policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change*, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1994.
- Volgy, T.J. & Schwarz, J.E. Foreign Policy Restructuring and the Myriads Webs of Restraint, in (eds) Hagan, J.D. & Rosati, J.A. & Sampson, M.W.III, *Foreign Policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change*, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1994.
- Warhurst, J. Patterns and Directions in Australian Politics over the Past Fifty Years, *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Volume 50, Number 2, 2004, pp.163-77.
- Wright-Neville, D. *East Asia and the "War on Terror": Why Human Rights Matter*, in (eds) Heijmans, A. & Simmonds, N. & van de Veen, H. *Searching for Peace in Asia Pacific*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, 2004